UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
24th meeting
held on
Monday, 23 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 24th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ALSAIDI (Yemen)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/47/SR.24
30 November 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

92-57947 6367S (E)

In the absence of Mr. Khouini (Tunisia), Mr. Alsaidi (Yemen), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (A/47/76, A/47/262, A/47/545, A/47/546, A/47/547, A/47/548, A/47/549, A/47/550 and A/47/551)

1. The CHAIRMAN drew the Committee's attention to additional letters pertaining to the item under discussion, contained in documents A/47/88, A/47/123, A/47/174, A/47/230, A/47/238, A/47/507, A/47/526, A/47/129, A/47/139, A/47/330, A/47/348, A/47/255 and A/47/592.

2. Mr. KALPAGE (Sri Lanka), Chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories, introducing the twenty-fourth report of the Special Committee (A/47/509), noted that it should be considered together with the two previous periodic reports (A/47/76 and A/47/262).

3. Once again, regrettably, Israel had failed to cooperate with the Special Committee by allowing it entry into the occupied territories, and it had therefore once more been unable to examine the situation in situ and to hear the position of the Israeli authorities. It had therefore used the best evidence available under the circumstances, including written information from various sources, the views of the Governments concerned and oral information received from persons having first-hand knowledge of the situation in the occupied territories.

4. The repression of the uprising that had begun four and a half years earlier had led to a continuation of the extremely tense situation in the occupied territories and had maintained a dramatic level of violence. The climate of uncertainty and frustration had been compounded by the disproportionate, and often unnecessary, use of force by the army and the police. The Special Committee had been particularly preoccupied by reports of increasingly systematic use of undercover units to infiltrate the population and carry out "death squad" killings, and by the continued increase in casualties among children as well as the broad application of new instructions to soldiers and civilians in the occupied territories concerning rules for opening fire against unarmed civilians without warning.

5. The erosion of human rights standards in the occupied territories had continued. The administration of justice had increasingly been transferred to military courts, latterly even for traffic offences. Administrative detention continued to be imposed in an arbitrary manner, often for excessive periods. Basic legal guarantees such as the right to a fair trial continued to be denied to Palestinians, and the pronounced discrepancy between the harshness

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

of their sentences and those pronounced against Israelis had been maintained. An additional grave deficiency in the administration of justice was the practice of dual punishment, whereby convicted persons had, in addition to receiving harsh sentences, had their houses demolished, thus affecting innocent members of their families.

6. The Special Committee had noted a further deterioration in the status and treatment of prisoners, particularly during interrogation. Systematic torture and physical and psychological ill-treatment were said to have resulted in severe injuries, permanent incapacitation and even death. Prison conditions continued to be critical. The civilian population had continued to be subjected to acts of harassment, including forcible entry into houses and attacks on occupants and property. Exorbitant fees were charged for indispensable administrative documents. Measures of collective punishment were still being taken against inhabitants of the occupied territories, such as the demolition of houses, particularly those belonging to detainees. The continued imposition of curfews had contributed to a further deterioration of living standards and a rise in unemployment.

7. Deportations on so-called security grounds had continued and measures of "disguised deportation" had been taken against certain students wishing to study abroad. However, it appeared that the Government of Israel was reconsidering the usefulness of deportations.

8. Restrictions on freedom of movement had compounded the difficulties caused by the prolonged closure of educational institutions. There were severe shortages of classrooms and teaching materials, and restrictions had been placed on the importation of books. Students who had obtained diplomas, through off-campus teaching, from universities subjected to official closure were unable to obtain employment in Israel and the occupied territories.

9. Settlement activity and the transfer of Israeli citizens, particularly recent immigrants from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, had intensified, apparently with intent to modify the demographic composition of the occupied territories by inducing Palestinians and other Arabs to leave. In spite of a number of encouraging statements on settlement policy by the Government of Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin following its election, the Special Committee remained preoccupied with the overwhelming preponderance of "security" over "political" settlements, especially in the Golan Heights and the Jordan valley.

10. Settlers had resorted to acts of violence and aggression, which the Israeli armed forces had seemingly been unable to control, against the Arab population of the occupied territories.

11. The Special Committee had concluded that the situation of basic human rights and fundamental freedoms in the occupied territories had remained extremely serious during the reporting period and still posed a threat to international peace and security. Occupation itself constituted a violation

(Mr. Kalpage, Sri Lanka)

of human rights and led to further violations. Israel's declared policy of reconciliation and the beginning of peace negotiations did not seem so far to have had a significant effect on the enjoyment of human rights by the people of the occupied territories. The Special Committee had therefore reiterated the need for a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict through negotiations, taking into account the rights of all peoples in the area. It hoped that the peace negotiations under way would bring about a climate of confidence and mutual trust conducive to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

12. The interests of all concerned would have been better served had Israel cooperated with the Special Committee, which could then have contributed to the dialogue currently under way. The Special Committee had again recommended urgent measures to safeguard the basic human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs in the occupied territories: application by Israel of the relevant provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention; full compliance with all resolutions of the Security Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies; cooperation with and support for the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross; support for UNRWA activities; and the creation of conditions of confidence and security conducive to promoting respect for human rights.

13. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine) said that the Committee's reports gave a clear picture of the reality of the situation in occupied Palestinian territory and revealed the scope of the brutality and repression practised by Israel, the occupying Power. The Committee had concluded that the policy of Israel continued to be one of de facto annexation, in violation of its obligations as a State Party to the fourth Geneva Convention.

14. Since the start of the intifadah, Israeli policy had taken a qualitative shift and had manifested itself in a constant escalation of repression. Orders for measures of collective punishment, such as curfews or home demolition, and for deportations, continued to be issued frequently. In the first three months of the current Israeli Government, 29 Palestinians had been killed by Israeli forces and at least 12 by Israeli undercover units (as compared to 28 in all of 1991); in Gaza, 363 Palestinians had been injured; about 4,000 dunums of land had been seized; 2,000 trees had been uprooted or destroyed; 64 homes had been either destroyed or sealed; round-the-clock curfews had been imposed on tens of thousands of Palestinians; construction of more than 20,000 housing units had been completed or approved in occupied territory; some schools had been closed indefinitely; and 12,500 Palestinian prisoners held in Israeli prisons had staged a hunger strike, during which one prisoner had died. Obviously, the level and intensity of human rights abuses had not decreased under the leadership of Prime Minister Rabin.

15. The savage policies and practices of Israel had not succeeded in containing or ending the intifadah, now entering its sixth year, which would continue until the occupation was ended and freedom and independence had been achieved for the Palestinian people. The siege of entire areas for days and

(Mr. Mansour, Observer, Palestine)

weeks, involving hundreds of thousands of people, was a crime against the Palestinian people; it was the duty and obligation of the international community not to allow such crimes to continue but to help Palestinians put an immediate end to the occupation.

16. Expropriation of Palestinian land, the construction of new illegal settlements and the enlargement of old ones, and settler terrorism against the Palestinian people threatened to sabotage the current peace process. The international community must uphold its pertinent resolutions and force Israel to stop its illegal settlement activities immediately.

17. The international community had always stressed the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967. Israel, however, while it had taken the legalistic position of rejecting de jure applicability of the Convention because it did not consider itself an occupying Power, had claimed to be in de facto accordance with the Convention. Such a travesty could no longer be responded to with another demand for compliance. Palestine reaffirmed its position concerning the need to provide international protection for its people in occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, through proper United Nations mechanisms, and reiterated its support for the Secretary-General's idea, incorporated in Security Council resolution 681 (1990), of further developing the idea of "convening a meeting of the high contracting parties to the fourth Geneva Convention ... to discuss possible measures that might be taken by them under the Convention". That Security Council mandate to the Secretary-General gave him significant and appropriate practical involvement in the occupied Palestinian territory. United Nations involvement, including full participation in the multilateral negotiations, was compatible with its historic role in the question of Palestine.

18. Mr. BATAINEH (Jordan) said that the relations between an occupying authority and an occupied people were by nature tense, for occupation itself was unnatural, and the conflict between the goals of the occupier and the vital interests of the occupied people must inevitably lead to more and more violent practices and violations of human rights. Thus, due to the long, unresolved suffering of the Palestinian people, the Palestinian question had become an outstanding case in modern history, while elsewhere the world was witnessing the end of polarization and the resolution of conflicts, based on democracy and respect for human rights, in peace, freedom and independence.

19. The record of relations between the Israeli occupying authorities and the Palestinian people was grievous, and the situation in the occupied territories remained critical and continued to deteriorate. As shown by the various reports of the Special Committee, daily events and practices in the occupied territories were hardly in keeping with the spirit of the current peace talks or the will of the international community to achieve a just peace.

(Mr. Bataineh, Jordan)

20. The situation of hundreds of thousands of Palestinians desiring to cross from Jordan to the West Bank but kept waiting at the frontier by Israel for lengthy periods remained distressing. The occupying authorities continued their abusive measures against civilians, including collective punishment, administrative detention, restriction of freedom of movement, the closing of areas, the destruction and sealing of houses and the uprooting of trees, in addition to the arrest, imprisonment and killing of Palestinian men and women. Israel had continued to support special "undercover" units of its army, which had resulted in a wave of arrests.

21. Israeli settlement policy, which had thus far involved the expropriation of 60 per cent of the land of the Palestinians, most of it agricultural, and the founding of approximately 200 Jewish settlements, had resulted in a new situation that imposed the hegemony of an armed alien national minority on the Arab population.

22. The Government of Jordan saw nothing in Israel's recently announced "confidence-building" measures that was in keeping with the spirit of the peace process: its "freeze on settlements" did not apply to the building of 11,000 housing units; the announced release of prisoners involved only a few hundred Palestinians who had already completed two thirds of their sentence terms, while tens of thousands remained in prisons or detainment camps; and a "lighter military presence" did not mean Israeli withdrawal or the cessation of its flagrant violations of human rights, the Charter of the United Nations and the fourth Geneva Convention. Accordingly, there was still an urgent need for a genuine, radical change in Israel's policies in the area of the basic rights and freedoms of the Palestinians living under occupation.

23. It was incumbent on the international community, which had established that the fourth Geneva Convention applied to the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967 and had repeatedly called on Israel to show compliance, to proceed without delay to assume responsibility for protecting the Palestinian people and guaranteeing Israeli respect for the human and legal rights of the Palestinians living under its occupation. Rapid steps for the implementation of the Convention in the occupied territories would serve as an indicator of Israel's real desire to build confidence and would have a favourable impact on the current peace negotiations. If Israel truly wanted peace and harmony with the countries of the region, it must take steps to improve the human rights situation in the occupied territories and, following the fundamental shift in international politics, turn from confrontation to cooperation in international affairs.

24. Mr. CLIFF (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Community and its member States, noted with satisfaction that for the first time the discussion of the item under consideration was taking place in parallel with detailed bilateral negotiations aimed at bringing about a comprehensive peace settlement in the Middle East based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The European Community and its Member States reiterated their full support for the peace process.

(Mr. Cliff, United Kingdom)

25. While the recent positive steps taken by the Israeli Government were welcome, practical measures taken towards abandoning illegal practices had been very limited and the daily lives of the Palestinians remained a matter of great concern. The Israeli authorities were still in breach of a number of their obligations under international law.

26. The European Community and its member States had always held that the fourth Geneva Convention applied to all the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including East Jerusalem, and urged the Government of Israel to accept its de jure applicability to the occupied territories and abide by its provisions. They called on Israel to halt all settlement activity in the occupied territories, which was illegal and an obstacle to peace, and affirmed that access to Jerusalem, the holy city of three religions, must be safeguarded for all in any future agreement on that city.

27. While some recent steps taken by the Israeli Government were commendable, more was required, especially in respect of the conditions in which Palestinian prisoners were held and interrogated, the sealing off of the occupied territories, curfews, restrictions on the movement of Palestinians and interference with relief efforts to the Palestinian people. It was of vital importance, in the context of the peace process, that the Palestinian negotiating team from the occupied territories should be free to travel to and from the talks.

28. The European Community and its member States were disturbed by the recent upsurge in violence in the Lebanon/Israeli border area, especially the attacks directed against the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon in defiance of its international status, and urged all Israeli forces to halt attacks in Southern Lebanon.

29. In view of the unique chance offered by the current peace process, they urged all the parties concerned to make the difficult decisions required for a definitive solution to the dispute.

The meeting rose at 11.55 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
25th meeting
held on
Tuesday, 24 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 25th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. FUENTES-IBAÑEZ (Bolivia)
(Vice-Chairman)

CONTENTS

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF KAYSONE PHOMVIHANE, PRESIDENT OF THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-57971 6373S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/47/SR.25
27 November 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

In the absence of Mr. Khouini (Tunisia), Mr. Fuentes-Ibañez (Bolivia), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

EXPRESSION OF SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF KAYSONE PHOMVIHANE, PRESIDENT OF THE LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

1. The CHAIRMAN, on behalf of all the members of the Committee, conveyed heartfelt condolences to the Government and the people of the Lao People's Democratic Republic and to the bereaved family, on the death of Kaysone Phomvihane.

2. Mr. BOUDTAVONG (Lao People's Democratic Republic) thanked the Chairman for the expression of sympathy.

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/47/76, 262, 509 and 545-551; A/SPC/47/L.25-L.31)

3. Mr. POSSO SERRANO (Ecuador) cautioned that the repetition of denunciations of Israel in the report of the Special Committee and the debates of the Committee and the automatic adoption of traditional resolutions to that effect by both the Committee and the plenary Assembly had virtually no practical value and actually serve to reduce a very serious problem in the occupied territories to a routine matter.

4. Perhaps during the current debate in the Committee, delegations, as they expressed their moral support for the Palestinian people, ought to voice some hope that the direct negotiations between Arabs and Israelis might prove to be the practical, viable road to a settlement of their problem, which had thus far eluded them.

5. Mr. ARTZIELI (Israel) said that, in order to set a tone conducive to the peace process that was under way and to reduce polemics, he would refrain from repeating familiar arguments put forward in the Committee by Israel in the past or responding to the falsities, inaccuracies or lack of objectivity of the Special Committee's report (A/47/509) or of some of the statements heard in the current debate. In his own statement on agenda item 73 at the Committee's 11th meeting, he had enumerated the various steps taken by Israel during the reporting period to improve the living conditions of the Palestinian Arabs and had elaborated on the gestures made recently by the new Government of Israel.

6. The solution to the Palestinian issue lay in direct negotiations which would be likely to lead to a political settlement. Israel and its Arab neighbours, including the Palestinians, were indeed engaged in face-to-face bilateral and multilateral talks. The new Government of Israel had declared its determination to achieve peace and end the Arab-Israeli conflict. In its

(Mr. Artzieli, Israel)

basic guidelines, it had indicated that it would work towards the creation of a new Middle East, in which resources would no longer be devoted to the arms race but to development, grounded in economic, cultural and scientific cooperation on a regional scale. In pursuit of that goal, Israel placed great importance on the multilateral negotiations that complemented the bilateral negotiations, viewing them as a promising opportunity to rebuild the Middle East, remove the threat of war and endemic poverty and create a prosperous and safe region for the benefit of all its inhabitants.

7. In the bilateral negotiations Israel was, of course, holding talks also with the Palestinians. In his first statement to the Knesset in October, Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin had repeated Israel's call not to miss seizing the opportunity for peace. Israel was offering the Palestinians interim self-government arrangements within a relatively short period of time, having presented them with a series of proposals that gave substance to the idea of autonomy and that would enable them to conduct their own affairs under an administrative-executive council composed of representatives of the residents of the territories, chosen by elections if they so wished. In the third year of the implementation of the interim arrangements, negotiations on a permanent settlement would commence, based on the principles set forth in the letter of invitation to the Madrid Conference.

8. Israel's Minister for Foreign Affairs, in his address earlier in the session to the plenary Assembly, had acknowledged that Israel's interim proposal was imperfect, since self-government was less than independence, and that it would not be an easy choice for either side to a long and painful conflict. But it was clearly a way out of the existing impasse, and there was no more promising foreseeable alternative.

9. In the Committee as well, all should look to the future rather than entrenching themselves in the positions of the past. The world had changed, the Middle East was changing, yet outdated resolutions of the United Nations were lagging behind. One-sided, distorted, hostile resolutions hindered the peace process. They should therefore be deferred, and if they were not, they should be voted down as contrary to the content and spirit of the direct talks being conducted between Israel and its Arab neighbours.

10. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that it would be a banality to state that the situation in the occupied territories - the intifadah and the peace process in the Middle East notwithstanding - had not fundamentally changed over the past decade; yet it was a truth that assumed the proportions of tragedy when measured against other problems that the United Nations had tackled successfully in the recent past. It was not an accident that the Organization's involvement in the question of Palestine as a whole had been limited, if not marginal, although the recent appointment of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General to the multilateral Middle East peace negotiations was encouraging and could well give momentum to the talks. As the peace process began to produce tangible results, a further enlargement of the United Nations role would be desirable.

(Mr. Freudenschuss, Austria)

11. Despite certain improvements in the situation in the occupied territories and the drop in the level of violence, as well as the more constructive approach of the current Israeli Government, which was welcome, the very essence of the problem remained the same: occupation, pure and simple. The aspirations of peoples could not be suppressed indefinitely, for they tended to assume almost mythical proportions and were ultimately unsubduable. The Committee's repeated appeals to Israel to respect the fourth Geneva Convention, to fulfil the more comprehensive obligations imposed by the customary law of human rights and to stop all settlement activities in the occupied territories would still be regarded only as a placebo by the Palestinians living in the occupied territories. What was really needed was a just and lasting political solution to the question of Palestine and the problem of the Middle East.

12. Mr. ALSAIDI (Yemen) said that, while the recent international détente had enabled international organizations to turn to the solution of regional conflicts, Israeli practices contrary to international custom and civilized behaviour created an obstacle to a just, comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli dispute, the cornerstone of which was the Palestinian question. The documents relating to the item under discussion clearly showed the oppressiveness of those practices and the patent discrepancy between Israel's stated policy regarding the occupied Arab territories and its shameful actual practices. The only change that had taken place was that the information policy of the Labour Party was cleverer than that of the Likud Party.

13. As affirmed by the report of the Special Committee, the difficulties faced by the inhabitants of the occupied Arab territories stemmed from the fact that the occupation itself was a violation of human rights. Therefore, Israeli practices designed to subjugate those inhabitants would end only with the end of the occupation, and until that time the situation in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, would remain grave.

14. His delegation felt that Security Council resolution 681 (1990) contained the necessary mechanism for limiting the suffering of unarmed citizens in the occupied Arab territories, provided Israel would abide by it. It supported the recommendation contained in the report of the Special Committee (A/47/509) that Israel should implement the fourth Geneva Convention and comply with the Security Council and General Assembly resolutions pertinent to the question of Palestine, that the Israeli authorities should cooperate with the International Committee of the Red Cross and that Members States should support the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The United Nations and its Member States must exert strong pressure on Israel in order to compel it to fulfil its obligations under the Convention.

15. His delegation hoped that the current negotiations would lead to a just and comprehensive solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict, which must, in order to be successful, include the self-determination of the Palestinian people.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
26th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 25 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 26th MEETING

Chairman:	Mr. KHOUINI	(Tunisia)
later:	Mr. AL-SAIDI (Vice-Chairman)	(Yemen)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58001 6404S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/47/SR.26
2 December 1992

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/47/76, 262, 509; A/SPC/47/L.25, L.26, L.27, L.28, L.29, L.30 and L.31)

1. The CHAIRMAN announced that India had become a sponsor of draft resolutions C, D and E contained in documents A/SPC/47/L.27, L.28 and L.29.

2. Mr. SHAHEED (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, as pointed out in the letter of transmittal of the Special Committee's report on Israeli practices (A/47/509), occupation itself engendered a situation where human rights violations would occur. Reviewing the letter of transmittal and the report itself, especially paragraphs 791-794, he said that Israel continued to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the occupied territories in violation of the fourth Geneva Convention, claiming that certain territories that it had occupied since 1967 constituted a part of the State of Israel, a claim that had been refuted unanimously by the international community.

3. The intensification of Israeli settlement activity and related measures such as the diversion of water resources, the uprooting of olive and citrus trees, the destruction of fields, the expropriation of land and others, indicated a will on the part of the Israeli authorities to modify the demographic composition of the occupied territories by inducing Palestinians and the other Arab population of the territories to leave their homeland.

4. Despite statements by Israel concerning changes in its settlement policy, the Jerusalem Post had announced, on 18 June 1992, the imminent launching of a major campaign to attract new residents to the occupied Syrian Golan, following earlier declarations by former Prime Minister Shamir and Mr. Rabin that the region would be kept by Israel because of its strategic importance. The newspaper had subsequently reported, on 15 July 1992, that the new Minister of Housing had indicated the possible establishment of new "security" settlements in the occupied Syrian Golan and the Jordan Valley.

5. According to the report of the Secretary-General contained in document A/46/263, there had been a constant increase in the number of Israeli settlers in the occupied Syrian Golan. Since the occupation of that area, the occupying authorities had established 20 settlements and built a number of factories and research centres; moreover, the inhabitants of the area were required to ask for permission even to collect rainwater.

6. The Arab inhabitants of the occupied Syrian Golan had been forced to demolish some of their own reservoirs, and the Israeli army had dynamited a number of others (A/47/294). Only three or four reservoirs were currently authorized for use, out of approximately 400 that had been built in the occupied Syrian Golan, and Ram Lake, the largest body of water in the occupied Syrian Golan, had been seized by the Israeli authorities. As a result,

(Mr. Shaheed, Syrian Arab Republic)

villages in the occupied Syrian Golan had suffered a critical shortfall in drinking and irrigation water, while the water of Ram Lake had been diverted to Israeli settlements to satisfy the needs of the settlers and their agricultural and industrial projects.

7. The Commission on Human Rights, in its resolution 1992/1, had strongly condemned Israel, the occupying Power, for its refusal to comply with the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly and the Security Council, particularly Security Council resolution 497 (1981), and had condemned numerous Israeli practices in the occupied Syrian Golan.

8. The current year marked the tenth anniversary of the heroic Golan uprising of February 1982, and the struggle of the Arab inhabitants of the occupied Syrian Golan had in fact never ceased, despite Israel's tyrannical practices. The difficult conditions under which those inhabitants were living, in particular the deteriorating economic and social conditions and the repressive measures affecting education, could be understood from the statement addressed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Special Committee (A/47/255).

9. The situation faced by the Palestinian and other Arab populations during the reporting period and the continued deterioration of their living conditions still represented a serious threat to international peace and security.

10. The reason for the refusal of the Israeli occupying authorities to cooperate with the Special Committee and for their negative attitude towards the United Nations and its resolutions was that they did not wish to reveal the grave violations of international law involved in their repressive practices against the occupied Arab territories.

11. The tyrannical practices of the Israeli occupying authorities were not at all in keeping with the efforts being made to achieve peace in the Middle East based on the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which meant complete withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem, and the guaranteeing of the national rights of the Palestinian people in accordance with United Nations resolutions.

12. Mr. ELARABY (Egypt) said that, over a year after the current peace negotiations with Israel had begun, the latest report of the Special Committee to investigate Israeli practices affecting the human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the occupied territories (A/47/509) was still full of human rights violations and grave infractions of international instruments, in particular the fourth Geneva Convention. Israel's continued occupation of Arab territories was in itself the greatest human rights violation, and Israeli measures aimed at altering the demographic, economic and natural character of the occupied territories was detrimental to the peace process, which was aimed at ending the Israeli occupation and bringing about a just, lasting and comprehensive peace between the Arab countries and Israel in order

(Mr. Elaraby, Egypt)

to enable the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate rights on its own territory, first and foremost of which was the right to self-determination.

13. The report had reiterated what was contained in the report of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and other relevant reports. The Israeli occupation authorities had continued to use indiscriminate violence to quell demonstrations and their use of live ammunition had resulted in numerous losses of life and severe injuries often leading to permanent incapacitation. There had been a deterioration of the economic, social and health conditions as a result of such Israeli measures as collective punishment, the demolition of houses and the use of curfews, as well as economic restrictions and limitations to the freedom of movement and work. Israeli measures had also hurt Palestinian educational institutions, thus affecting a whole generation of young Palestinians. There had been continued acts of aggression committed by Israeli settlers, and further new settlements had been built. Despite the declarations of the newly elected Government regarding curtailment of settlement activities, Israel still refused to comply with international law, which prohibited the building of settlements of any kind in any part of the occupied Arab territories. The report had also noted grave and multiple violations of the fourth Geneva Convention.

14. The new Israeli Government had taken limited positive steps to build confidence between it and the Palestinian people. However, if it wished to build real confidence it must refrain completely from all the practices noted in the report. He thanked the Special Committee for its report and appreciated its efforts to fulfil its mandate, which was made all the more difficult by Israel's lack of cooperation and its refusal to allow the Special Committee to visit the occupied territories, as well as by its prevention of Palestinians from leaving the occupied territories in order to appear before the Committee.

15. He still hoped that the current peace negotiations would be successful and would enable the occupied Arab territories to be liberated and the Palestinian people to exercise all of its legitimate rights. The United Nations was well placed to contribute to the peace efforts in the Middle East, and he hoped that it would be invited to participate in the multilateral negotiations on cooperation regarding such regional issues as the Palestine refugees. The United Nations could play a major role in peace-keeping and confidence-building, as well as providing protection to the Palestinians in the occupied territories in pursuance of various resolutions to that effect and, in particular, Security Council resolution 681 (1990). The Special Committee should be empowered to verify Israel's discharge of its duties and responsibilities as an occupying Power, as well as of any other commitments agreed to in the peace negotiations. His delegation therefore called for the mandate of the Committee to be renewed and hoped that its discussion of the agenda item under consideration at the next General Assembly would be an occasion to celebrate the advent of a comprehensive and just peace which would put an end to the suffering of the Palestinian people under occupation and in exile.

16. Mr. ZVONKO (Belarus) said that, while agenda items concerning issues of peace and security in the Middle East reflected some of the greatest and most deeply rooted conflicts in the world, the generally improving international situation had been accompanied by definite changes in the situation in the region. The Madrid meeting had marked a turning point in the history of the Middle East.

17. While Belarus believed that the new Government of Israel was sincere in its recent statements regarding its intention to seek new and practical approaches to problems in the Middle East, the extensive and well-documented report of the Special Committee (A/47/509) showed that the situation in the occupied territories remained extremely tense. All too often violence had claimed the lives of a large number of civilians including women, children and elderly people.

18. Turning to the conclusions of the report, he expressed his Government's profound concern regarding violations of fundamental human rights in the occupied territories, specifically, the rights enumerated in the fourth Geneva Convention, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, as well as numerous resolutions of the United Nations and its specialized agencies. As the Special Committee's report had emphasized, the essential fact underlying the hardships of the people of the occupied territories was that the occupation itself was a violation of human rights. Belarus endorsed the Special Committee's conclusion that the steady deterioration of living conditions in the occupied territories represented a serious threat to international peace and stability. Belarus believed that regardless of the complexity of the issues involved, a comprehensive and final settlement to the problem of the occupied territories could and should be obtained. Madrid represented the beginning of a peaceful, though complex, stage of negotiations; it was now up to the world community to exert the greatest possible effort to encourage the continuation of the peace process.

19. For its part, Israel should offer concrete proof of its political will, strive once and for all to reject actions incompatible with international standards of human rights and, at the same time, remove the obstacles to a peaceful, comprehensive and final settlement of the Middle East crisis.

20. Mr. LOTFI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that the reports of the Special Committee (A/47/76, 262 and 509) reflected a further deterioration of the human rights situation in the occupied territories. In the view of his delegation, the grave situation in the occupied territories was the result of a combination of factors, including the continuing occupation of Palestine by the Zionists as a result of their policy of annexation, restrictions on the fundamental and inalienable rights of the people of Palestine, the imposition of inhumane living conditions and the deterioration of the economic, social, educational and health conditions of the Palestinians. In that connection he drew attention to paragraph 92 of the most recent report (A/47/509) concerning the adverse impact on the living conditions of Palestinians of the

(Mr. Lotfi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

acceleration of Israeli settlement activity in response to a new wave of Jewish immigration from Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

21. He also drew attention to the Secretary-General's report (A/47/294) which had noted that more than 52 per cent of the total land area of the West Bank, 42.3 per cent of the Gaza Strip and 69.4 per cent of the Golan Heights had been confiscated by the occupying authorities. Significantly, settlement development in the territories had been three times higher than the rate announced by the Israeli Minister of Housing.

22. As the Special Committee's report had made clear, during the period under review, the fundamental rights of Palestinians and other Arabs had been routinely violated by such measures as collective punishments and the systematic use of curfews; those violations of human rights compounded the hardships suffered by Palestinians as a result of the steady deterioration of economic, social and health conditions. Freedom of education had also been adversely affected by an increasingly restrictive identity-card regime for students in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, and limitations on the exercise of other fundamental rights such as freedom of movement inside and outside the territories had continued to have an adverse effect on the employment of Arab workers.

23. The report also presented statistics regarding the high rate of killings, arrests, detentions and ill-treatment of detainees in the territories. One particularly alarming aspect of the data was the significant increase in the number of casualties among children in the territories. According to paragraph 800 of the report, in the first four years of the intifadah, approximately 33 per cent of the Palestinians killed had been 17 years of age or under.

24. Furthermore, the situation with respect to detainees had continued to worsen. According to an estimate from the Palestine Human Rights Information Center, over 120,000 persons had been arrested and held for 24 hours since the beginning of the intifadah. According to testimony heard by the Special Committee, systematic torture and physical and psychological mistreatment of detainees had also been observed. A press release issued by the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) strongly urged the occupying authorities to prohibit all forms of ill-treatment of Palestinian detainees under interrogation. In light of such conditions, the intifadah could be viewed quite clearly as the natural response of a nation which had lived under occupation and had suffered the ruthless attacks of occupying forces for over 40 years.

25. He expressed his delegation's appreciation to ICRC and UNRWA for creating better living conditions and reducing the suffering of Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories.

(Mr. Lotfi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

26. He concluded by noting that a just and lasting solution to the issue of Palestine would be found in the restoration of all the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, including the establishment of an independent State in the entire land of Palestine.

27. Mr. KUSHAIRI (Malaysia) said that the long list of Israeli repressive measures in violation of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions, the fourth Geneva Convention (1949) and norms of international law had been well catalogued in the Special Committee's reports and by other independent and impartial observers. Those measures entailed serious social, economic, educational and psychological consequences, and were among the consequences of the Israeli military occupation which in itself constituted a grave violation of international law.

28. The human rights situation of the Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories remained a matter of concern to the international community, but a disquieting development was the continued increase in the number of casualties among women and children. It was time for the international community to take the necessary measures to ensure the physical protection and safety of the Palestinian people by having the United Nations monitor the situation. His delegation was also deeply concerned at the continued and intensified harassment by the Israeli authorities directed against educational institutions in the occupied territories. It condemned the systematic Israeli campaign of repression against and arbitrary closure of universities, schools and other educational institutions. The prolonged closure of schools and universities had now become one of the central pillars of the colonizing policy in the occupied territories. His delegation demanded that Israel immediately stop all actions that were hindering the effective operation of Palestinian educational institutions in the occupied territories.

29. The Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories were not only deprived of their fundamental rights and freedoms but were facing new measures aimed at destroying their economy. His delegation strongly deplored Israeli practices of land confiscation, uprooting of trees, seizure of merchandise, closure of shops, expropriation and diversion of water and depletion of other Palestinian economic resources. The occupying Power's taxation policy, which imposed extremely heavy taxes on the Palestinians were another factor contributing to the further deterioration of their already difficult economic situation.

30. In addition to the harsh measures employed by the Israeli authorities against the Palestinians, they continued to harass the personnel of UNRWA in violation of the Agency's privileges and immunities. His delegation wished to reaffirm its appreciation of the invaluable work carried out by UNRWA under difficult and often dangerous circumstances and joined others in calling on Israel to desist from further acts of harassing and obstructing its work.

(Mr. Kushairi, Malaysia)

31. The issue of illegal Israeli settlement and land confiscation in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, remained a matter of concern. To ensure the success of the current Middle East peace negotiations, the new Israeli Government should demonstrate its sincerity by freezing the construction of new settlements and halting the confiscation of land and other resources in the occupied territories. Any exceptions to that policy, even on so-called security grounds would add to the climate of distrust rather than help bring about the confidence-building that was needed to further the peace process.

32. The fact that a peace process was under way did not detract in any way from Israel's obligation to respect the fourth Geneva Convention and the relevant Security Council resolutions. His delegation urged the Security Council to implement its resolutions 672 (1990) and 681 (1990), which asked for action by the signatory States and by the Secretary-General to ensure observance of the Convention. It was regrettable that resolution 681 (1990) had not been fully implemented, in particular the provision requesting the Secretary-General to monitor the situation regarding Palestinian civilians under Israeli occupation and to keep the Security Council informed. His delegation looked forward to the report of the Secretary-General called for in paragraph 7 of resolution 681 (1990) and believed that the time had come for the General Assembly and the Security Council to consider sending United Nations observers to the occupied territories. It remained convinced that a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian question could only be realized through total and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Palestinian and Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem. The current peace process would succeed only when the Israelis were truly committed to the principle of "land for peace" and moved quickly towards an interim period of self-government, to be followed by a process leading towards self-determination and finally the establishment of an independent Palestinian State.

33. Mr. AL-ZAYANI (Bahrain) regretted that the customary Israeli practices against the civilian population in the occupied territories still persisted, despite the implicit need for policy changes in view of the developments taking place on the political and diplomatic fronts. The Special Committee's report (A/47/509) reflected the extremely tense situation prevailing in those territories since the beginning of the intifadah: it referred to the heavy toll of civilian casualties caused by the indiscriminate use of violence by the Israeli authorities; to the hardships suffered by the population owing to the steadily deteriorating economic, social and health conditions, compounded by the resort to measures of collective punishment; and to the increasing climate of uncertainty and frustration caused by acts of aggression by Israeli settlers and Israel's annexation policy, which created more new settlements. In short, the Palestinian people and the Syrian Arabs in the Golan would continue to suffer and be deprived of their human rights and fundamental freedoms unless the occupation ended.

34. Mr. BISHR (United Arab Emirates), referring to the continued Israeli practices against the population in the occupied territories as catalogued in the Special Committee's report (A/47/509), said that Israel's flagrant violations of the fourth Geneva Convention showed its disdain for human dignity. The measures taken by the Israeli authorities aimed to alter the demographic structure in the occupied territories by causing Palestinians and other Arabs to leave. Moreover, according to recent Israeli newspaper reports, settlements were now being established at three times the previous rate, while large areas of Arab village land had been confiscated by the Israel Defence Forces. Israel continued to violate the fourth Geneva Convention and ignore the relevant provisions of the main human rights instruments. The international community should therefore rise to the challenge thus presented by urging Israel to comply with the Convention. In order to guarantee that compliance, all States parties should agree to the proposal, contained in Security Council resolution 681 (1990) and supported by his country, to the effect that the parties to the Convention should meet to discuss possible measures to be taken under the Convention.

35. Mr. OULD MOHAMED MAHMOUD (Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the Arab Maghreb Union (AMU), said that the information contained in the Special Committee's report showed no discernible improvement in the conditions of Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories. Indeed, tension continued to prevail and had become particularly acute following the outbreak of the intifadah.

36. While the opening of the Madrid Peace Conference and the election of a new, more pragmatic Israeli administration had revived hopes for a fair settlement for the Palestinians and a comprehensive Middle East peace, those hopes remained to be realized. Israel continued to obstruct the work of the Committee by preventing it from effectively fulfilling its mandate. Moreover, Palestinians and other Arabs in the occupied territories continued to live under extremely precarious conditions. The fundamental rights of Palestinians and other Arabs continued to be violated on a daily basis by the occupation forces. In flagrant violation of article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention, Israel continued to expel Palestinian citizens. In that connection, he drew attention to the statement in the report that Israel had expelled six Palestinian students to Jordan following the five-day siege of Al-Najah National University in Nablus. Against the background of the Prime Minister of Israel's statement of 24 August 1992 regarding Israel's intention to abolish completely the sentence of expulsion, the Government's expulsion of the students was particularly symbolic. Furthermore, world attention had lately been focused once again on the continuing deterioration of conditions of detention of Palestinian political prisoners. He noted that since the outbreak of the intifadah, more than 28 Palestinians had died in detention.

37. While freedom of the press and freedom of information remained non-existent in the occupied territories, in Jeruslaem they were subject to constant challenge. For example, on 9 July 1992, the Israeli High Court of

(Mr. Ould Mohamed Mahmoud, Mauritania)

Justice had refused to grant a licence to the newspaper Al-Wafa. In addition, the many examples of repression enumerated in the Committee's report provided a graphic illustration of the bleak situation currently prevailing in the territories. The repression had affected thousands of Palestinians - including a large number of children - who had been detained, imprisoned or sometimes simply beaten.

38. Further, despite the international community's condemnation of the practice of establishing settlements in the occupied territories, no outright ban on that practice had been implemented. The distinction which the new Israeli administration had drawn between "political settlements" and "security settlements" - in addition to being illegal and arbitrary - proved that Israel had not completely rejected its settlement policy. Such actions not only threatened the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, but also constituted a threat to the peace and security of the entire region.

39. Israel continued to defy Security Council resolutions, General Assembly resolutions and international human rights conventions, in particular the fourth Geneva Convention. Its current negotiating position ignored the sense and even the explicit wording of resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) which were the foundations on which the peace negotiations had been based.

40. The AMU member States remained deeply concerned about the situation prevailing in Palestine and in the occupied Arab territories. In their opinion, in order to avoid further deterioration of the already grave situation in the occupied territories, the international community should take further steps to induce Israel to desist from practices which violated human rights. In addition, participants at the Peace Conference should redouble their efforts to put an end to the occupation, which remained the most prominent human rights violation in the region. At a time when the world was witnessing an evolution in the direction of greater respect for human rights and freedoms, the world community should intensify its efforts to bring Israel into compliance with the applicable United Nations resolutions and to recognize explicitly the legitimate and inalienable rights of the Palestinian people.

41. He concluded by reaffirming the support of the AMU member States for the Palestinian people in its struggle - under the leadership of its sole legitimate representative, the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) - to regain its dignity and to establish its own independent and sovereign State.

42. Mr. AL-SAIDI (Yemen), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

43. Mr. JAYA (Brunei Darussalam) said that his Government felt compelled once again to state its profound disappointment with continued Israeli violation of the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories. Brunei felt nothing but sympathy for the families of the large numbers of Palestinians who - as shown in the report - had been killed, either by Israeli troops or Israeli civilians.

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei Darussalam)

44. Brunei noted with great concern the Special Committee's reports regarding harassment and physical ill-treatment suffered by Palestinian civilians and detainees, as well as the continuing policy of collective punishment through the demolition or sealing-up of the houses of suspected offenders, the imposition of curfews and the closing-off of areas upon suspicion of anti-Israeli activities. In addition, Palestinian youths were being deprived of their fundamental rights to an education as a result of the frequent closures of schools and universities on the pretext that students had been involved in intifadah activities. The disturbances caused by frequent closure orders had undoubtedly affected the academic performance of Palestinian youth.

45. Brunei viewed the continued Israeli violation of the fundamental human rights of the Palestinian people as an effort to repress the intifadah, which was an expression of the national will and determination of the Palestinian people to remain in their homeland and to attain their inalienable rights.

46. His delegation deplored the Israeli settlement policy which was aimed at confiscating Palestinian land and changing the demographic composition of the territories. His Government considered the policy of resettling Jewish citizens and new immigrants in the occupied territories as an unprecedented threat to the future of Palestinian political rights and resources, particularly land and water. Although Israel had recently cancelled some contracts for new construction in the occupied Palestinian and Arab territories, it had not yet committed itself to a total halt to settlement activites in the territories. His Government believed that a partial freeze on settlements was not enough and that Israel should commit itself to a total halt of settlement activities in the occupied territories as those activities were a violation of the principles of the United Nations and the fourth Geneva Convention. In addition, there was reason for concern with respect to Israel's decision to allow Jewish settlers in the occupied territories to establish their own armed police units. Those units had created tensions between the settlers and the Palestinians.

47. Brunei welcomed the convening of the Madrid Conference and the subsequent bilateral talks between the parties in Washington. He expressed his delegation's earnest hope that the talks would eventually lead to a comprehensive settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the Middle East. Brunei saw Israel's readiness to grant autonomy or self-rule to the Palestinians as an encouraging sign and hoped that it would be a step towards the eventual granting of self-determination, independence and sovereign statehood. He reiterated his Government's support for the struggle of the Palestinian people - under the leadership of the PLO, who Brunei recognized as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people - to realize their inalienable right to self-determination, independence and sovereign statehood in their own homeland.

48. He shared the view of the international community that peace would come to the Middle East only when the core problem of Palestine was resolved. His

(Mr. Jaya, Brunei Darussalam)

delegation therefore reiterated its call to the Israelis to abide by all relevant United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), and urged the international community to continue to exercise its influence towards convincing the Israeli administration to accept all the relevant United Nations resolutions. The provision of political, military and economic support had made Israel only more intransigent and defiant of the wishes of the international community.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE
27th meeting
held on
Wednesday, 25 November 1992
at 3 p.m.
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 27th MEETING

Chairman: Mr. KHOUINI (Tunisia)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued)

Reports of the Secretary-General

AGENDA ITEM 73: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINE REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued)

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-58025 6507S (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/SPC/47/SR.27
15 December 1992
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 3.20 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 74: REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE ISRAELI PRACTICES AFFECTING THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF THE PALESTINIAN PEOPLE AND OTHER ARABS OF THE OCCUPIED TERRITORIES (continued) (A/47/76, A/47/262 and A/47/509; A/SPC/47/L.25-L.31)

Reports of the Secretary-General (A/47/545-551)

1. Mr. SHEVCHENKO (Ukraine) said that the international community must urge Israel to end the deportation of Palestinian civilians and accept the de jure applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to all the occupied territories. Despite the partial freeze, the construction of settlements in the occupied territories, including Jerusalem, remained a matter of concern to his delegation, since some of the new settlers came from Ukraine. Israel should reconsider that policy and stop its confiscation of land, which would remove one of the major obstacles to peace in the Middle East.

2. Ukraine hoped that the current peace process would result in a comprehensive political settlement - the conflict being essentially political - on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Noting the lack of progress, he stressed the essential role that the United Nations could play in the negotiations. A solution to the Middle East conflict was all the more imperative since it was one of the world's most militarized regions. In addition, for Ukraine, it was a neighbouring region.

3. His delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolutions submitted, but regretted that they did not address the complex issue in its entirety. He trusted that future resolutions would be more balanced.

4. Mr. AL-RASSI (Saudi Arabia) denounced the repressive measures taken by Israel, including the use of secret units which, completely autonomously, targeted the "freedom fighters" to be murdered. Nevertheless, those practices had not undermined the will of the Palestinian people to attain their rights, including the right to self-determination.

5. It was true that Israel had recently taken measures to ease some of the restrictions imposed on the Palestinians, and his delegation welcomed any measure to that end. Nevertheless, occupation remained occupation.

6. The international community must persuade Israel to accept the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the territories occupied by it. And Israel had an interest in so doing, since such a confidence-building measure would have a positive effect on the current peace process.

7. Mr. SALIMI (Afghanistan) recalled the Israeli arsenal of repressive measures, and stressed that the establishment of Jewish colonies in the occupied territories was in clear contravention of international legal instruments, including the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, and hindered the success of the negotiating process.

8. Afghanistan condemned the attacks on the holy places of Israel and Christianity, with the aim of annexing Al-Quds.

9. His delegation welcomed the current negotiations and hoped that they would lead to the attainment of the legitimate rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to an independent State in Palestine.

10. Mr. KA (Senegal) stressed the precariousness of the lives of the population of the occupied Arab territories, and recalled the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to those territories, including Jerusalem. His delegation, while taking note of the new provisions and repeated appeals for peace issuing from the Israeli authorities, called upon the latter to improve the day-to-day living conditions of the inhabitants of the occupied territories so as not to push them into acts of violence and desperation.

11. With respect to the negotiating process begun in October 1991, he said that the willingness of the parties to negotiate for peace should be translated into practice through the implementation of the relevant international legal instruments. By establishing confidence, ending violence, creating a climate of confidence in the camps and improving the living conditions of the population, the Israeli Government could create conditions propitious to conclusion of the negotiations. In that connection, it was the duty of the international community to assist the parties to reach a comprehensive political settlement of the Middle East question in a manner that would redress the economic, political and moral injustices perpetrated upon the Arab people of Palestine for more than 40 years.

12. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had concluded its general debate on agenda item 74. Under that item it had before it draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.25 to L.31. India had joined the sponsors of draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.27, L.28 and L.29.

13. Mr. HUQ (Bangladesh) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.25, L.29, L.30 and L.31 on behalf of the sponsors. The question of Palestine was one of the greatest tragedies of modern times, and the position of his Government was consistent and categorical: Bangladesh's support for the Palestinian cause was unwavering. It was apparent from the Special Committee's report that the Israel authorities continued to violate the rights of the Palestinians and other Arabs living in the occupied territories, employing brutal means of repression which neither women nor children nor the elderly escaped, and which constituted flagrant violations of the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention and of the various resolutions of the Security Council on the question.

(Mr. Huo, Bangladesh)

14. His delegation hoped that the talks currently under way would lead to a just and lasting solution to the problem and that the peace process would take into account the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people. A comprehensive, just and durable solution to the conflict could not be achieved unless Israel withdrew from Palestine, including Jerusalem and the territories occupied since 1967, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973) and other relevant resolutions.

15. Since the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee did not differ much from those adopted by the General Assembly at its previous session, the sponsors hoped that they would be adopted by a wide majority.

16. Mr. MORENO FERNANDEZ (Cuba) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.26, L.27 and L.28 on behalf of their sponsors. Those resolutions reflected the sponsors' position regarding Israeli practices affecting the Palestinian people and other inhabitants of the occupied territories. He hoped that the draft resolutions would receive the broadest possible support.

17. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that the United States had a strong interest in the human rights situation in the occupied territories and maintained a constant dialogue with the Government of Israel on the subject. When the United States disagreed with Israeli policies, it made its views known to the Government of Israel and would continue to do so.

18. However, the peace process that had begun in Madrid in 1991 had radically changed the situation. Israel and its neighbours were currently engaged in direct negotiations on the issues presented in the draft resolutions. The rhetoric of past years should give way to an attitude that was more conducive to reconciliation and dialogue. Far from contributing to the protection of the human rights of the Palestinians in the occupied territories or promoting the search for a just and lasting peace, the one-sided and harsh language of the draft resolutions served only to divide the parties even further and make a negotiated settlement more difficult to achieve.

19. His delegation would have preferred that the Committee deferred its consideration of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25. While it was true that the wording of the draft was not identical to that of the similar resolution adopted in 1991, and that it no longer contained references to "war crimes" and other unsubstantiated Israeli practices, his delegation nevertheless reaffirmed its objection to the substance of the draft. The United States could not support a provision urging the Security Council to consider measures to secure "international protection" for the Palestinian inhabitants of the occupied territories, which was impractical and did not address the underlying problems.

20. His delegation supported the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. It therefore requested a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.26,

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

which it supported. His delegation would abstain in the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because the strident rhetoric that it contained did nothing to resolve the problems it sought to address.

21. Israel's establishment of new colonies in the occupied territories was an obstacle to peace. The United States would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.27 because it was unproductive to debate over the legalities of the issue, which diverted attention from the real task of promoting peace through direct negotiations.

22. His delegation could not support draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.28 because it did not address legitimate security problems as they existed in the occupied territories. Moreover, the United States remained opposed to the practice of administrative detention.

23. While it continued to oppose Israel's expulsion of Palestinian residents of the occupied territories, his delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.29 because its harsh polemical tone offered no realistic solution.

24. His delegation had always considered that the Golan was occupied Syrian territory and that the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention therefore applied to it. The United States was opposed to any unilateral action to alter the status of the territories occupied by Israel in 1967 because that was an issue that must be resolved through negotiations in accordance with Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). His delegation would abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.30 because of its harsh and unbalanced wording.

25. The United States strongly objected to the content of paragraph 4 of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.30.

26. In spite of strong concerns over the current situation with respect to education in the occupied territories, his delegation objected to draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.31 because sweeping condemnation of Israeli policies and practices was unjustified and counter-productive.

27. Finally, his delegation objected to references to Jerusalem in phrases such as "occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem and other Arab territories occupied by Israel since 1967". Those phrases, which described the territories demographically, were limited to territories occupied in 1967 and did not prejudge their status, which could be resolved only through negotiations. The United States was convinced that Jerusalem must remain undivided but that its final status should be decided through negotiations.

28. Mr. PODTSEROB (Russian Federation) said that the situation in the occupied territories had long been a matter of concern to the United Nations; however, the new measures aimed at normalization had somewhat improved the state of affairs. It was to be hoped that the negotiators and all interested parties would adopt a constructive approach. It was up to the United Nations to create an atmosphere conducive to the success of the negotiations; in that regard, his delegation was pleased that the overall tone of the discussion had been a little more restrained at the current session. The Russian Federation nevertheless considered that General Assembly resolutions should not deal with any of the issues that were currently the subject of negotiations. That was why the Russian Federation would abstain in the vote on all the draft resolutions, except the one dealing with the applicability of the Geneva Convention in the occupied territories.

29. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Romania, United States of America, Uruguay.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Spain, Suriname, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

30. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25 was adopted by 74 votes to 6, with 43 abstentions.

31. A separate recorded vote was taken on paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.26.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: None.

32. Paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.26 was adopted by 123 votes to 1.

33. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.26 as a whole.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein,

Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Micronesia (Federated States of), Paraguay, Russian Federation, United States of America.

34. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.26 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

35. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.27.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Micronesia (Federated States of), Russian Federation, United States of America.

36. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.27 was adopted by 119 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

37. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.28.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Micronesia (Federated States of), Paraguay, Russian Federation.

38. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.28 was adopted by 118 votes to 2, with 3 abstentions.

39. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.29.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Micronesia (Federated States of), Paraguay, Russian Federation, United States of America.

40. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.29 was adopted by 118 votes to 1, with 4 abstentions.

41. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.30.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives,

Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel.

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Micronesia (Federated States of), Paraguay, Russian Federation, United States of America.

42. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.30 was adopted by 116 votes to 1, with 5 abstentions.

43. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.31.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Canada, Côte d'Ivoire, Micronesia (Federated States of), Paraguay, Russian Federation.

44. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.31 was adopted by 116 votes to 2, with 5 abstentions.

45. The CHAIRMAN invited those delegations wishing to explain their vote after the vote to do so.

46. Mr. FREUDENSCHUSS (Austria) said that his delegation, which rejected Israeli practices in the occupied territories, had voted for all the draft resolutions except one. It had abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25 because, in spite of the changes made as compared with the 1991 text, his delegation considered some of the formulations contained in it unacceptable.

47. He pointed out that the participation of Yugoslavia in the work of the Special Committee, whose mandate the Third Committee had just extended, would contravene the provisions of Security Council resolution 777 (1992) and General Assembly resolution 47/1.

48. Miss HYLAND (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that they would have preferred not to have had draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25 put to the vote because, despite some improvements over the resolution adopted in 1991, it still contained tendentious language which would not contribute to the peace process.

49. Ms. BIRD (Australia) said that her delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions but one (A/SPC/47/L.25), but that it would have abstained if there had been a separate vote on paragraph 1 of draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.29 and L.30, which contained references to previous resolutions which Australia had not supported.

50. While Australia had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.31, it was nevertheless concerned at the continued closing of schools and universities by the Israeli authorities.

51. Her delegation also wished to state its understanding that the language used to refer to the occupied territories in the resolutions which had just been adopted and in other resolutions considered under other items referred only to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967.

52. Her delegation would like to suggest that the resolutions relating to agenda item 74 might be reviewed in 1993 with a view to minimizing repetition and duplication and ensuring that they reflected any developments in the situation.

53. Mr. TAYLOR (Canada) said that, despite the importance which his delegation attached to the obligations of States under the fourth Geneva Convention, it would have preferred to defer consideration of draft resolution "A" (A/SPC/47/L.25) in view of the peace process which had been initiated and the need for a calm and positive climate. Although an effort had been made to make the wording of the resolution less divisive than that used in similar resolutions in previous years, it was in places still tendentious and sometimes violent and prejudged the motives and responsibility for actions attributed to the Israeli Government.

54. Similarly, his delegation believed that the wording of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.31 did not reflect the improvement in the situation with regard to education in the occupied territories; for that reason, Canada had once again abstained in the vote on the draft resolution.

55. In general, the tone of the resolutions did not fully reflect the progress made in recent months. Polemics and recriminations should give way to a climate more favourable to the advancement of the peace process.

56. Mr. LOTFI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that, in view of the importance which his country attached to improving the lot of the Palestinian people, his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. It had, however, reservations with regard to any language which implied recognition, implicit or explicit, of the Zionist entity.

57. Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) said that his delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions. He emphasized that the United Nations had a collective responsibility with regard to the Palestinian refugees and that UNRWA was the basic instrument available to it to relieve the sufferings of the Palestinian people. His delegation believed that the Israeli Government should recognize the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied territories and put an end to any practices in breach of that Convention.

58. He believed that the question of Israeli practices in the occupied territories should be considered in the general context of the Middle East problem and, in particular, in the light of the realities of the peace process initiated in Madrid in 1991 which, even if it had not brought about a substantial improvement in the daily lives of the Palestinians in the occupied territories, gave grounds for hope that the parties to the process were no longer irrevocably tied to their long-standing positions. Turkey had welcomed the measures taken recently by the Israeli authorities to restore confidence in the region. His delegation regretted that the draft resolutions did not reflect the recent progress.

59. Mr. WIDE (Sweden) said that his delegation had voted in favour of six of the seven draft resolutions. It supported the substance of most of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25 because it was seriously concerned about certain Israeli practices described therein. It had, however, abstained in the vote, despite the improvements made in the text compared with that adopted in 1991,

(Mr. Wide, Sweden)

since some statements in the resolution were not justified and the request in paragraph 10 did not fall within the mandate given to the General Assembly.

60. His delegation had voted in favour of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.30, but remained opposed to resolution ES-9/1, mentioned in the preamble.

61. Ms. RAVN (Norway) said that her delegation had voted in favour of all the draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 74 with the exception of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25. The new Israeli Government had shown itself to be more conciliatory with regard to the Palestinian population; it had taken encouraging measures, such as the freeze on the construction of settlements in the occupied territories, and had a positive attitude during the negotiations in connection with the International Peace Conference on the Middle East. Norway once again appealed to Israel to apply the fourth Geneva Convention to the occupied territories.

62. Mr. ALVAREZ (Uruguay) said that his delegation was very concerned about the situation described in draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.25. While it recognized that the sponsors of the draft resolution had endeavoured to make improvements in the text compared with that adopted in previous years, it nevertheless believed that it was too tendentious to be acceptable.

AGENDA ITEM 73: UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND WORKS AGENCY FOR PALESTINIAN REFUGEES IN THE NEAR EAST (continued) (A/SPC/47/L.14 to 24)

63. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America), introducing draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.14, said that the United States continued to support the work of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) and commended its efforts to meet the emergency needs of the refugees displaced as a result of the Gulf conflict, as well as those affected by the violence in Lebanon and those living in the occupied territories. The United States appealed to all countries, in particular those in the region, to donate generously to UNRWA. The United States was committed to the search for a just and lasting comprehensive peace settlement and to that end supported the direct bilateral negotiations between Israel, the Arab States and the Palestinians on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973).

64. Ms. MINDERHOUD (Netherlands) introduced draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.15 on behalf of the 23 sponsors and expressed the hope that it would be adopted without a vote, as in previous years.

65. Mr. WIDE (Sweden) introduced draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.16 and expressed the hope that it would be adopted by consensus.

66. Mr. ZIAUDDIN (Bangladesh), introducing draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.17, L.20, L.21 and L.23, pointed out that UNRWA had been established as a temporary agency and that its mandate could be terminated if a just and lasting solution to the problem of Palestine could be found. His country hoped that the current peace process in the Middle East would lead to a satisfactory solution.

67. Mr. MURTAZA (Pakistan) introduced draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.18, L.19, L.22 and L.24. Pakistan was following with keen interest the current Middle East peace negotiations and believed that a lasting solution should be based on Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). Pakistan was concerned over the report of the Commissioner-General of UNRWA, in particular the problems encountered by the staff of the Agency in the discharge of their functions. It was only because of the presence of UNRWA that the people of Palestine had access to educational, health and relief services.

68. The CHAIRMAN invited delegations which wished to explain their votes before the vote to do so.

69. Mr. SHERMAN (United States of America) said that his delegation supported draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.14, of which it was a sponsor, and reiterated its support for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The United States was pleased to join in the consensus on draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.15 and A/SPC/47/L.16. His delegation also supported draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.17, but had reservations with regard to paragraph 5, since it was opposed to the establishment of the University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds".

70. His delegation would vote against draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.18 to L.24 since the texts were highly politicized, criticized Israel's treatment of refugees and contained proposals that were financially unsound. Such draft resolutions made no practical contribution to UNRWA's objectives and only served to exacerbate tensions. Thus, draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.18 made no reference to the negotiations conducted by the parties to the conflict with a view to achieving a comprehensive and lasting peace. Further, with respect to the issuance of identification cards to Palestine refugees, only the Commissioner-General should have authority to administer UNRWA programmes. His delegation opposed measures taken by Israel that were inconsistent with international law, such as the destruction of dwellings in the occupied territories. The United States would not, however, object in principle to the voluntary relocation of refugees.

71. His delegation opposed draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.19 because it attempted to usurp the authority of the Commissioner-General, who had decided to end the distribution of rations to refugees, he having sole authority for decisions relating to the administration of UNRWA programmes.

72. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.20 was unacceptable since it did not refer to the ongoing direct negotiations among the parties concerned.

(Mr. Sherman, United States)

73. The United States objected to draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.21 since it did not place the question of compensation for refugees in the context of a negotiated settlement.

74. Equally, his delegation did not support draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.22 owing to its extreme and biased language.

75. The United States also opposed draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.23, which was unrealistic and offered no practical approach to the problem. It would be inappropriate for the General Assembly to take a decision regarding the University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds".

76. Lastly, his delegation was opposed to draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.24. His Government was deeply concerned over school closures and the disruption of UNRWA activities, and continued to discuss those concerns with Israel, an approach which had resulted in positive changes that had not been reflected in the draft resolution.

77. Mr. PODTSEROB (Russian Federation) paid tribute to UNRWA and stressed the importance of the humanitarian assistance it provided. Nevertheless, a genuine solution to the question of Palestine must be found within the framework of the current peace process. More than ever the parties to the negotiations must evidence a positive and constructive spirit and reject any measures that would undermine the negotiations, for a climate propitious to the settlement of the question must be established. Accordingly it was not desirable to adopt draft resolutions on questions under consideration in the negotiations. His delegation would thus abstain in the votes on draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.20, L.21, L.22 and L.23. Nevertheless UNRWA must continue its activities, given which he supported the other draft resolutions submitted under agenda item 73.

78. The CHAIRMAN, before inviting the Committee to vote, said, with regard to the programme budget implications of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.15 concerning the Working Group on the Financing of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, that the Programme Planning and Budget Division had indicated that if the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would be asked to provide the necessary services to the Working Group. In accordance with activities covered under section 3 (Political and Security Council affairs), subprogramme 1 (Security Council and political committees activities), of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 1992-1993 (A/46/6/Rev.1), substantive services for the Working Group were already provided for. With regard to conference-servicing needs, it was assumed that the Working Group would hold 10 meetings in New York in 1993, but that services would be provided on an as-available basis under the regular programme of the Office of Conference Services. The draft resolution would thus not result in any additional expenditure.

(The Chairman)

79. With regard to draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.18 on Palestine refugees in the Palestinian territory occupied by Israel since 1967, the Programme Planning and Budget Division had indicated in its report on the question (A/47/489) that the Secretary-General was unable to comply with the request addressed to him in General Assembly resolution 46/46 E, paragraph 3, that he should resume issuing identification cards to all Palestine refugees and their descendants. The report further indicated that the Commissioner-General did not have the means to issue identity cards as such. The Secretary-General regretted that he was unable to comply with the same request addressed to him in paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.18. Should the General Assembly adopt the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would, however, keep the situation under review with the aim of determining whether it was possible to comply with the request.

80. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.14.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

81. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.14 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

82. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.15 was adopted without a vote.

83. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.16 was adopted without a vote.

84. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.17.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: None.

Abstaining: Israel.

85. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.17 was adopted by 122 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

86. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.18.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana,

Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

87. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.18 was adopted by 119 votes to 2.

88. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.19.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Fiji, Greece, Liechtenstein, Marshall Islands, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Spain.

89. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.19 was adopted by 86 votes to 22, with 14 abstentions.

90. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.20.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

91. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.20 was adopted by 87 votes to 2, with 32 abstentions.

92. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.21.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait,

Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Sweden, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

93. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.21 was adopted by 85 votes to 2, with 34 abstentions.

94. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.22.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Russian Federation.

95. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.22 was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

96. The CHAIRMAN, referring to the financial implications of draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.23 concerning the University of Jerusalem "Al-Quds" for Palestine refugees, said that the Programme Planning and Budget Division had informed him that if the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, the Secretary-General would continue to consider that in order to follow up the provisions of paragraph 2, the functional feasibility study undertaken pursuant to previous resolutions of the General Assembly on the issue (see document A/47/601) would have to be completed. As that did not seem possible at present, the Secretary-General was not in a position to prepare a statement of the financial implications. If there was a change in the situation in 1993, steps could be taken under procedures for unforeseen and extraordinary expenditures. Proposals and a statement of estimated expenditures would then be submitted to the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session, together with the report requested in paragraph 4 of the draft resolution.

97. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.23.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: Russian Federation.

98. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.23 was adopted by 119 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

99. A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.24.

In favour: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Israel, United States of America.

Abstaining: None.

100. Draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.24 was adopted by 119 votes to 2.

101. Mr. MANSOUR (Israel) said that, by abstaining on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.14, his delegation was expressing its consistent opposition to paragraph 11 of General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948 and paragraph 2 of General Assembly resolution 513 (VI) of 26 January 1952. The Working Group on refugee issues had recently held another session in Ottowa with the participation of some 40 countries, as well as the United Nations. One-sided United Nations resolutions had done nothing to help resolve the plight of the refugees. It was through the bilateral and multilateral talks which his country was currently holding with its Arab neighbours that the

(Mr. Mansour, Israel)

question of Arab and Jewish refugees would be discussed and, it was to be hoped, resolved. His delegation's abstention on draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.14 would have no bearing on the work and the extension of the mandate of UNRWA. As his delegation had stated before the Committee at previous sessions and during the current year's debate on the question, his Government would continue to cooperate with UNRWA to enable it to fulfil its important humanitarian task.

102. Miss HYLAND (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the 12 States members of the European Community, said that the fact that the Twelve had voted against or abstained in the vote on certain draft resolutions did not mean that UNRWA would not continue to enjoy their support. They were also concerned about the financial situation of the Agency and, for humanitarian reasons, they supported the development of the various services provided to Palestinian refugees. However, they felt that some of the requests addressed to the Commissioner-General were unrealistic.

103. Ms. BIRD (Australia) said that some of the issues concerning Palestinian refugees, dealt with in the draft resolutions just adopted, were being considered by the multilateral working group on refugees in the context of the negotiations currently in progress. The resolutions should not prejudge the outcome of those negotiations.

104. With respect to draft resolution A/SPC/47/L.24, her delegation said that, while it regretted certain irksome Israeli practices affecting educational institutions and UNRWA facilities, it welcomed the reopening of all universities in the occupied territories.

105. Mr. LOTFI (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation had voted for draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.14 to L.24 because of Iran's commitment to the Palestinian cause. His delegation nevertheless reiterated its well-known reservations concerning the wording of certain provisions of the drafts that, explicitly or implicitly, recognized the Zionist entity.

106. Mr. FUENTES-IBAÑEZ (Bolivia) said that his delegation had not supported certain draft resolutions because their wording reflected the hard line that had been adopted in recent years. While it was highly concerned at the sacrifices made by the Palestinians, his delegation was encouraged by the progress that had been achieved and the statement made by the Israeli Prime Minister, Mr. Rabin, during a recent interview broadcast by a French television station. It was important to exercise restraint until the outcome of the negotiations.

107. Mr. MANSOUR (Observer for Palestine) thanked the countries that had voted for the draft resolutions that had just been adopted. The large number of delegations voting in favour of the draft resolutions demonstrated how much support there was for the struggle of the Palestinian people. The implementation of the provisions of those draft resolutions should make it possible to improve the lot of the Palestinian people.

108. Mr. VALDEZ (Paraguay) said that his delegation had mistakenly abstained in the vote on draft resolutions A/SPC/47/L.28, L.29, L.30 and L.31, while it had wished not to take part in the vote.

109. The CHAIRMAN said that the Committee had completed its consideration of agenda item 73, and that the Pledging Conference for UNRWA would take place on Wednesday, 2 December 1992, at 10 a.m. in the Trusteeship Council.

COMPLETION OF THE COMMITTEE'S WORK

110. After an exchange of courtesies, in which Mr. DHALLADOO (Mauritius), on behalf of the Group of African States, Mr. AL-SUWAIDI (United Arab Emirates), on behalf of the Group of Asian States, Mr. ALIYEV (Azerbaijan), on behalf of the Group of Eastern European States, Mr. BIVERO (Venezuela), on behalf of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States, and Mr. URTASUN (Spain), on behalf of the Group of Western European and Other States, took part, the CHAIRMAN declared that the Special Political Committee had completed its work for the forty-seventh session.

The meeting rose at 6.25 p.m.